

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,591	08/14/2001	Louis L. Hsu	728-216 (YOR9-2001-0444 U	9143
7590 12/24/2003			EXAMINER	
Paul J. Farrell, Esq.			NGUYEN, DANNY	
DILWORTH &	BARRESE LLP			
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Uniondale, NY	11553		2836	

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		_	
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/929,591	HSU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Danny Nguyen	2836	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 08 November 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica	ition. A proper reply to a	, <b>n</b>
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See N	MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period or fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Ci	f extension and the corresponding amount he shortened statutory period for reply on e later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate	extension
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR).	Brief must be filed within the pe (1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	riod set forth in the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	cause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);		
<ul> <li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	better form for appeal by mater	ially reducing or simplify	ing the
<ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceling</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>	ng a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):	`	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		parate, timely filed amen	dment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	ered but does NOT plac	e the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		issues which were new	ly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment( explanation of how the new or amended claims wor	s) a) will not be entered or b)[	will be entered and ar	1
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: NONE.			
Claim(s) objected to: NONE.			1
Claim(s) rejected: 1-22			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appro	oved or b) disapproved by th	e Examiner.	
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement			
10. Other:		Hoslin Wac	kson
	<i>ا</i> ر	STEPHEN W. JACKSON 12- PRIMARY EXAMINER	72-03

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued that Keeth does not disclose at least one enable/disable circuit for selectively connecting and disconnecting at least one portion of the respective macro from the integrated circuit system. However, Keeth discloses enable/disable circuit for selectively connecting and disconnecting at least one portion of the respective macro from the integrated circuit system (e.g. see col. 3, lines 55-59). Therefore, applicant's arguments of claims 1 and 12 do not distinguish over Keeth.

STEPHEN W. JACKSON

Stephen Jackson